THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.13224 of 2006

25.7.2006

Between:

Mohd. Hameed, S/o.Shareef

… Petitioner

AND

The Special Officer, Land Reforms, Ranga Reddy District
And others

… Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.13224 of 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner is resident of Pudoor Village of Medchal Mandal in Ranga Reddy District. He was allegedly assigned the land admeasuring Acs.1.27 guntas in survey No.464/2 of Pudoor Village by proceedings dated 24.4.1992 issued by the Mandal Revenue Officer (MRO), the third respondent herein. Be it noted that the said land was declared to be agricultural surplus land under the provisions of A.P.Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 (Land Reforms Act, for brevity). The petitioner's grievance is that though the land was assigned to him, after collecting the requisite market value, possession was not handed over to him. Therefore, he filed the present writ petition, after lapse of fourteen (14) years.

The delay on the part of the petitioner is not properly explained. Be that as it is, at the stage of admission itself, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General) brought to the notice of this Court that by reason of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.23102 of 1996 dated 31.10.1996, the declarant under the Land Reforms Act should not be dispossessed. He further submits that the declarant filed Land Reforms Appeal being L.R.A.No.33 of 1994 on the file of the Land Reforms Appellate Tribunal-cum-II Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District, which is still pending. In view of the same, the possession could not be handed over to the petitioner.

As there is justification for the respondents in not handing over the land to the petitioner, this Court cannot issue any direction at this stage. The petitioner may approach the third respondent as and when the L.R.A. No.33 of 1994 is disposed of by the Land Reforms Appellate Tribunal-cum-II Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District.

The writ petition, with the above observations, is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO,J**)

July 25, 2006.

YS